United States Court of Appeals

FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

_				
1	No. 03-2236			
Joann Brewer Wiley,	*			
Plaintiff - Appellant,	* *			
V.	*			
Kurt Knickrehm, individually and in	n *			
his official capacity as Director of the Department of Human Services,	ne * *			
Defendants - Appellees,	*	Appeal from the United States District Court for the		
David Fray, in his individual capaci	ty, *	Eastern District of Arkansas.		
Defendant,	*	[UNPUBLISHED]		
Bob Clark, individually and in his official capacity as Conway Human	*			
Development Center Superintenden Calvin Price, individually and in his	t; *			
official capacity as Conway Human				
Development Center Assistant; Beverly Peterson, individually and i	n *			
her official capacity as Conway Hur Development Center Total Care Tea	ım *			
Leader; Marilyn Junyor, individuall and in her official capacity as Nurse	*			
Service Administrator at Conway Human Development Center; Charle				
Green, in his official capacity as Director of Arkansas Department of	*			

Human Services, Division of Human

Developmental Disabilities Services,

*

Defendants - Appellees.

*

Submitted: December 18, 2003

Filed: May 13, 2004

Before MELLOY, MCMILLIAN, and BOWMAN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

The District Court¹ granted summary judgment in favor of all defendants on Joann Brewer Wiley's claims under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 and the Arkansas Civil Rights Act for speech retaliation, as well as on her claim under the Family and Medical Leave Act. Wiley appeals only the speech-retaliation portion of the District Court's decision.

Having carefully reviewed de novo the issues raised in this appeal, we hold that the District Court correctly held that no reasonable juror could conclude that Wiley's speech played a substantial role in any adverse employment action taken against her. We also hold that the District Court properly analyzed Wiley's speech-retaliation claim under the test set forth in Mt. Healthy City School District Board of Education v. Doyle, 429 U.S. 274 (1977). Inasmuch as we agree entirely with the District Court's resolution of the case, we need not, and do not, reach the argument of defendants that they were entitled to qualified immunity from suit in this case.

¹The Honorable G. Thomas Eisele, United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

	Finding no error of	law, we affirm	on the basis	of the District	t Court's thorou	ıgh
and w	vell-reasoned order.	See 8th Cir. R.	47B.			